



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/633,475	07/31/2003	Derek O'Hagan	PP01388.211	3256

7590 08/10/2004

Alisa A. Harbin, Esq.
Chiron Corporation
Intellectual Property - R440
P.O. Box 8097
Emeryville, CA 94662-8097

EXAMINER

LUCAS, ZACHARIAH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1648

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/633,475	Applicant(s) O'HAGAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Zachariah Lucas	Art Unit 1648	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,6-9,11-14,17-26,28-35,38,40-42 and 52-91 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims subject to restriction and/or election requirement are 1-4,6-9,11-14,17-26,28-38,40-42 and 52-91.

Art Unit: 1648

DETAILED ACTION

1. Currently, claims 1-4,6-9,11-14,17-26,28-35,38,40-42 and 52-91 are pending in the application.
2. The preliminary amendment filed on July 31, 2003 has been entered. It is noted that the amendment cancels reference in the first paragraph of the application to any earlier U.S. application other than the immediate parent 09/581,772 filed on June 15. Thus, although the copy of the declaration from the parent application has been filed in the present application (naming other earlier applications), in view of the amendment, the present application is entitled only to the June 15, 2000 priority date under 35 USC §120. If this was not the Applicant's intent, then the Applicant's attention is drawn to 37 CFR 1.78(2) and (3).

Election/Restrictions

3. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14, 35, 52-63, 68, 69, 74, 75, 80, 81, 86, 87, drawn to microparticles with an adjuvant adsorbed to the surface, and compositions thereof, classified in class 424, subclass 280.1.
 - II. Claims 17-26, 28-34, drawn to methods of making microparticles with an adjuvant adsorbed thereto, classified in class 424, subclass 489.
 - III. Claims 38, 64, 70, 76, 82, and 88, drawn to methods of delivering an adjuvant to a subject through administration of a microparticle with the adjuvant adsorbed to the surface, classified in class 424, subclass 278.1.

Art Unit: 1648

- IV. Claims 40, 65, 71, 77, 83, and 89, drawn to methods for the treatment of a disease through administration of a microparticle with the adjuvant adsorbed to the surface, classified in class 424, subclass 490.
- V. Claims 41, 42, 66, 67, 72, 73, 78, 79, 84, 85, 90, and 91, drawn to methods of raising an immune response through administration of a microparticle with an adjuvant adsorbed to the surface, classified in class 424, subclass 184.1.

For each of Groups I-V above, restriction to one of the following is also required under 35 USC 121. Therefore, election is required of one of Groups I-V, and one from each of the following groups of subinventions.

In addition to the election of one of groups I-V above, the Applicant is additionally required to elect

- (A) one of the types of polymers identified in (e.g.) claim 3;
- (B) one of the embodiments wherein the surfactant is either (1) anionic or (2) cationic;
- (C) one of the embodiments wherein the antigen is
 - (a) either a polypeptide or a polynucleotide
 - (b) from a pathogenic organism or a tumor, and
 - if the Applicant elects pathogens, the Applicant is additionally required to elect one of the pathogens listed in (e.g.) claim 56.
 - (c) adsorbed to the surface of, or encapsulated by, the microparticle; and
- (D) one of the embodiments of adjuvants listed (e.g.) in claim 12.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

- 4. The subinventions identified in groups (A)-(D) are not related. . Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01).

In the instant case, the subinventions each relate to microparticles made of different compositions thereby having different modes of operation, or that comprise different antigens and adjuvants and therefore have different functions and effects.

Art Unit: 1648

5. The inventions of Groups II and I are related as process of making and product made.

The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the claimed product may be made through alternative methods, for example by spray-drying and coacervation.

6. The inventions of Group I and Groups III-V are related as product and process of use.

The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the product may be used in any of the processes described in groups III-V.

7. The inventions of Groups III-V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case, the different inventions each relate to a different method of using a product, each of which achieves a different function and has different effects.

Species Election

8. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Art Unit: 1648

If the Applicant elects the polymer poly(α -hydroxy acid) above, applicant is additionally required to elect one of the species listed in (e.g.) claim 4.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 3 is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 1648

9. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above, have acquired a separate status in art because of recognized divergent subject matter and different classifications, and because the literature and sequence searches required for any one of the groups is not required for the others, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

10. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Art Unit: 1648

11. It is here noted that some of the restrictions requirements made above fall within the scope of PTO Linking claim practice. In accordance with this practice as described in MPEP 809.03, linking claims will be considered with the elected invention. If the elected invention is found allowable, the linking claim will also be examined. If no substantive rejection is found for the linking claim, the restriction among the Groups it comprises will be withdrawn. Claim 1 is considered a linking claim to the various microparticle compositions.


12. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).


13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zachariah Lucas whose telephone number is 571-272-0905. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Housel can be reached on 571-272-0902. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1648

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Z. Lucas
Patent Examiner


JAMES HOUSEL 8/7/04
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600